UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/904,557 | 07/16/2001 | Takahiko Ishiguro | Q65441 | 6024 |
| 65565 SUGHRUE-265 | 7590 08/13/200 5 550 | | EXAMINER | |
| 2100 PENNSY | LVANIA AVE. NW | SHAW, AMANDA MARIE | | |
| WASHINGTO | N, DC 20037-3213 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1634 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/13/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 09/904,557 | ISHIGURO ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| AMANDA SHAW | 1634 | | |

| | AMANDA SHAW | 1634 | |
|--|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the d | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>14 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL | ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (i) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejection | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extraction date of the structure of the strength o | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. 🔯 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b | out prior to the date of filing a brief. | will not be entered be | cause |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | | | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | | ,, | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | er form for appeal by materially rec | ducing or simplifying th | ne issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | orresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.13 | 16 and 41.33(a)). | | |
| 4. \square The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 1. See attached Notice of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all- non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, t | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none. Claim(s) objected to: none. Claim(s) rejected: 13-15. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none. | · — | l be entered and an e: | xplanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing an entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fails | s to provide a |
| 10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatior | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. \square Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (| PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| 13. | | | |
| | /Carla Myers/ | | |
| | Primary Examiner, Art U | nit 1634 | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendments made to claims 13 and 14 raise new issues because the scope of the claims has changed. Previously the claims recited a step of "repeating (B) on at least one selected portion of said selected DNA molecule that is different from, non overlapping with, and adjacent to the selected portion of (b)". The term "adjacent" was given its broadest reasonable interpretation because the term was not defined in the specification and the specification did not provide any guidance for determining whether two genomic regions are adjacent. However now the claims have removed the term "adjacent" and replaced it with "not separated by any intervening nucleotides". Thus further search and consideration would be required. As a result the proposed amendments do not place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regard to the art rejections the Applicants arguments pertain both to the pending claims and the amended claims. The arguments that pertain only to the claims as amended are considered moot in view of the non entry of the after final amendment. Regarding the pending rejections the Applicants argue that Kondo does not utilize an RNA transcriptable promoter sequence on the primer that mediates double stranded DNA product formation therefore Kondo fails to teach each and every element of claim 13. This argument has been fully considered but is not persuasive. Kondo teaches a method which requires a first primer (used to form RNA/DNA duplexes) and a second primer (used to form DNA/DNA duplexes). In the instant case both of these primers have a promoter sequence of a DNA dependent RNA polymerase at the 5' terminal (See Col 3, lines 55-67 or Col 5, lines 25-35). As such Kondo teaches each and every limitation required by step (B)(i)(c) of claim 13. Therefore all of the art rejections are maintained.